

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-18 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 4-18 are amended. Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 18 may be found on p. 4, lines 20-23 of the specification, for example. No new matter is added.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 4, 6, 9-15 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Lotze (U.S. 6,591,208); claims 2, 3, 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Lotze in view of McMurtry (U.S. 5,152,072); claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Lotze in view of Nai (U.S. 6,568,242); and claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Lotze in view of Bernhardt (U.S. 5,594,668). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Office Action asserts that Lotze discloses determining the load factor applied by an articulating probe head. See paragraph 2, citing Lotze col. 3, lines 43-50 and col. 4, lines 10-13. However, Applicants respectfully submit that Lotze does not disclose or suggest determining a load or one or more factors which relate to the load applied by a motion of the articulating probe head about said at least one axis at any particular instant, as recited in claim 1, and similar recited in claim 18.

Lotze does not disclose an articulating probe head. Instead, Lotze merely discloses a probe head which may be moved in three coordinate directions (x, y, z) via a portal assembly (see col. 3, lines 23-30) and may be deflected from a rest position (see col. 3, lines 40-44). Thus, Lotze cannot disclose or suggest determining a load or one or more factors which relate to the load applied by a motion of the articulating probe head about said at least one axis at any particular instant, as recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in claim 18. Accordingly, Lotze does not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claims 1 and 18.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that McMurtry, Nai and Bernhardt are silent regarding determining a load or one or more factors which relate to the load applied by a motion of the articulating probe head about said at least one axis at any particular instant, as

recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in claim 18. Thus, McMurtry, Nai and Bernhardt do not supply the subject matter missing from Lotze.

In view of the above, Lotze, McMurtry, Nai and Bernhardt, individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claims 1 and 18. Claims 2-17 ultimately depend from claim 1. Thus, Lotze, McMurtry, Nai and Bernhardt, individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claims 1-18. Withdrawal of the rejections of these claims under 35 U.S.C. §§102/103 is respectfully solicited.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-18 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Kipman T. Werking  
Registration No. 60,187

JAO:KTW/acd

Date: May 23, 2008

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 320850**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--